

## Board of Supervisors County of Los Angeles

November 10, 2009

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH SUPERVISOR

Mr. Michael R. Peevey, President California Public Utilities Commission 505 Van Ness Avenue

505 Van Ness Avenue | San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mr. Peevey

In August, Southern California Edison filed application, A.09-08-020 "Wildfire Cost Recovery," with the California Public Utilities Commission seeking approval to create a mechanism to allow for cost recovery for damages to their transmission system associated with wildfires. The application asks for approval to establish a Wildfire Expense Balancing Account to cover uninsured costs arising from wildfires, including;

- · Payments to satisfy wildfire claims,
- · Outside legal costs incurred in defenses of wildfire claims,
- · Pay for premiums for insurance against wildfire claims,
- The costs of financing these amounts.

It is unconscionable that Southern California Edison has asked for this rate increase approval on current rate-payers when it has failed to work with the local communities in planning or implementing their new transmission projects. Specifically, this is demonstrated by the Antelope Valley Transmission project in which the initial segments have been approved and additional segments are pending approval by the CPUC.

Although my constituents residing in North Los Angeles County actively communicated their concerns and were involved in the preparation of an EIR/EIS for Edison's project, most residents feel that Southern California Edison ignored their suggestions and effective mitigation measures were not implemented. Decisions were made without notification to residents. For example, Leona Valley residents voiced concerns about construction on private property and the excessive use of helicopters for construction in and around Leona Valley. Santa Clarita residents were distressed about large lattice towers constructed rather than the smaller poles discussed in previous community meetings.

There remains substantial concern about utility line alignments being selected due more to the convenience of utilities and Federal and State agencies and less to the impacts upon local residents.

## Page: 2

Now, Southern California Edison wants the rate payers to pay for the increased costs for fire hazards and damages to their system, based on their own poor planning of alignment and community outreach. If SCE had listened to the concerns of the residents and the local governmental jurisdiction, and had worked in a positive and cooperative sprit in the beginning of this planning process, there would not be a need for them to request approval for a rate increase. For this reason, I am opposed to the requested rate increase and I am asking the California Public Utilities Commission to deny the application of A.09-08-020.

Thank you for your review and consideration on this issue.

Sincerely

MCHAEL D. ANTONOVICH

Supervisor

cc: Dian M. Grueneich, Commissioner

John Bohn, Commissioner Rachelle Chong, Commissioner Timothy Simon, Commissioner Leslie E. Starck, Vice President